

WEATHER.
Partly cloudy tonight and tomorrow;
continued cool.
Temperature for twenty-four hours end-
ing 8 p.m. today: high, 48; low, 34; m.
yesterday: lowest, 48; at 6 p.m. today,
48.
Full report on page 14.
CLOSING NEW YORK STOCKS PAGE 14.

No. 26,816. ** WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1917—EIGHTEEN PAGES. ONE CENT

U. S. KNOWS PERSONS WHO RECEIVED MONEY IN PASSPORT FRAUDS

List Contains Scores of Names of Americans Formerly in Pay of Germany and Amounts Run High.

FURTHER SENSATIONAL DISCLOSURES MAY BE GIVEN TO PUBLIC ANY TIME

Representative Norton of North Dakota Severely Criticizes Repre- sentative Heflin's Statement Regarding the Bernstorff "Slush" Fund on Floor of House.

Although there is no indication of what will be the State Department's next disclosure of German intrigue in America or elsewhere, it is known that disclosures as sensational as any yet published are being held in reserve and may be made at any time.

One of the things the State Department has is a list of persons who received German money in the passport frauds. The munitions plots and practically all the other activities of German intrigue here took place between the beginning of the war in August, 1914, and the entry of the United States into the conflict. This list is said to contain scores of names and the amounts of money represented run very high.

From time to time the department also probably will make public certain evidence to dispose of the denials of those who have been involved in the disclosures already made.

The Bernstorff "slush" fund issue was reopened in the House today when Representative Norton of North Dakota made one of the severest criticisms of Representative Heflin the House has heard in years.

The North Dakota member addressed his remarks to the statement last week of Mr. Heflin that he could name thirteen or fourteen senators and representatives who had acted suspiciously and that he had heard a story that a cardroom was maintained in Washington, at which pro-Germans and pacifists could get money.

Expressing doubt as to the truth of Mr. Heflin's charges, Mr. Norton said: "If he got down on his marrow bones in front of this House he could not cleanse his fault."

Exciting Scene in House as Heflin Is Challenged to Name Suspected Men

Representative Norton of South Dakota and Representative Heflin of Alabama clashed in the House of Representatives this afternoon in one of the most dramatic episodes in recent years at the Capitol. When Representative Norton denounced the Alabama democrat for his speech Friday attributing disloyalty to thirteen members of the Senate and House. In the midst of violent applause Representative Norton charged that Representative Heflin had made a statement in the House that he had heard a story that a cardroom was maintained in Washington, at which pro-Germans and pacifists could get money.

Representative Heflin repeated that he had his suspicions about some of the men in the House.

Challenged to Name Them.

At that point Representative Caraway of Arkansas arose.

"Will you name them," he asked.

At this the House burst forth into a roar of cheers. Members called out "That's the stuff" and "Good work, Caraway."

Representative Heflin evaded the question several times, but, finally driven by the taunts of the House, he made the flat statement that he could not name the men, but that he had heard a story that a cardroom was maintained in Washington, at which pro-Germans and pacifists could get money.

Following his speech, Representative Fordney presented a lengthy resolution providing for a thorough inquiry into Representative Heflin's own statement on the floor, and his reported interview with Speaker Clark immediately referred the resolution to the rules committee.

Several members objected to this on the ground that the House should act upon it immediately.

After considerable discussion, however, it was decided that the resolution was not of a character which permitted its immediate adoption.

Matter of Highest Privilege.

The matter was taken up by Representative Norton as soon as the House met today as a matter of the highest privilege. He read from the speech of Representative Heflin, made Friday, in reference to the cable message sent by von Bernstorff to his home government in Germany, and that statement of the House which had been influencing Congress. Mr. Norton also read from a published interview in a newspaper in which Representative Heflin was quoted as saying he had heard of a gambling house in Washington, at which pro-Germans obtained money if they sat in the game. Representative Heflin denied the wording of the interview.

When Representative Norton arose Mr. Heflin sought to interrupt, but Mr. Norton declined to yield. Immediately Mr. Heflin made a point of no quorum, saying he wanted "a full House" to hear the discussion.

A quorum having been quickly obtained, the galleries filled, and Speaker Clark, warning the House that it probably would be an exciting day, said he wanted perfect order.

Mr. Norton took the floor. Mr. Heflin insisted that he be given time to reply to him. The Speaker said he would rule later on the point. Mr. Norton entered upon one of the severest criticisms of Mr. Heflin that the House has heard applied to any member in many years.

The declaration of Mr. Heflin, coming from a member, and coupled with newspaper attacks on the House, which have run in recent years, constituted the severest possible sort of a reflection, Mr. Norton declared, at least should he have made the House that left him.

RUSSIA REGAINS KERNISKY IN REVOLUT

Petrograd Reports Success Against Germans on the Front Near Riga.

KERENSKY IN REVOLUT

By the Associated Press.
PETROGRAD, September 24.—Russian forces on the Riga front, in the region south of the Pskov high road, yesterday took the offensive and after a fierce struggle occupied the German position in the sector of Silzeme, the Russian war office announced today.

Charges Against Kerensky.

PETROGRAD, September 24.—The Korniloff mystery, arising out of the recent revolt, has developed dimensions which threaten the existence of the cabinet, particularly the positions of Premier Kerensky. The newspapers representing the left and the right parties demand an explanation from the government, while the Bolshevik organs openly accuse the premier, in the words of the Nabetchi Pool, of being in a conspiracy with Korniloff to crush the Petrograd proletariat and the workmen's and soldiers' delegates with the help of cavalry corps sent against Petrograd.

The newspapers ask why, if the published documents are forged, no denial has been issued.

Maxim Gorky's paper Novaya Zhizn, which being unfriendly toward Kerensky, must be taken with reserve, declares that the affair is causing a sensation in the ranks of the government and that M. Terestchenko, the foreign minister, Saturday converted by telephone with M. Kerensky about this matter, whereupon Kerensky postponed his return to Petrograd. The newspaper adds that the members of the government had decided that M. Kerensky should make a statement on the subject.

Explanation Is Demanded.

A more serious indication of trouble is that the Bolshevik group in the bureau of the central workmen's and soldiers' delegates has carried by an overwhelming majority a resolution demanding an explanation. The resolution refers to the Korniloff episode, to the alleged members and agents of the provisional government in connection with the preparation of a conspiracy against the revolution, and continues:

"The plan was to announce an individual of collective dictatorship, at the same time declaring Petrograd under martial law, then mercifully to break up the Korniloff army, and to turn the working class organizations under the pretext of crushing an imaginary Bolshevik plot."

The signatories of the resolution demand that the members of the working class organizations be given the right to elect their own representatives to the cabinet ministers, Skobelev (labor), Avskentiev (interior) and Tchernoff (agriculture), make a statement of all the facts known to them.

Preceding Negotiations Show.

Petrograd newspapers publish columns of revelations and interviews with the chief actors in the revolt and, while much is still in the air, the picture of the negotiations between Premier Kerensky and Gen. Korniloff for the establishment of a strong government, Petrograd, preceded the rebellion. The march of Gen. Korniloff's troops on the capital is said to have been part of a plan to overthrow the government, and the revelations have made an overwhelming impression on the members of the government.

The plan and that these ministers are awaiting Premier Kerensky's explanation.

Gen. Savinkoff, ex-director of the war department and later commander of the Petrograd garrison, was reported to have declared that he was dispatched to Gen. Korniloff by Premier Kerensky, with a mission to ask the Russian commander-in-chief to lead a strong cavalry corps against the "savage" division of Korniloff.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.

Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute, Gen. Korniloff, the newspaper says, who was in bad political repute.



UNIONS TO RATIFY SHIPYARD WAGES

Temporary Schedule Agreed to in San Francisco Comes Up at Special Meetings.

STRIKE IN PORTLAND, ORE.

By the Associated Press.
SAN FRANCISCO, September 24.—Unions affiliated with the Iron Trades Council here were sending out notices today of special meetings at which the question of ratifying the temporary wage schedule agreed upon last night by the strike last Monday, is expected to be resumed by Thursday.

Adoption of the temporary schedule followed a week's strike of 30,000 metal trades' unionists. Their demand for a six-dollar-a-day minimum, an advance of 50 per cent over the scale carried in the contract which expired September 15, will be left for final adjudication to the federal board of arbitration.

Work on \$150,000,000 governmental shipbuilding contracts, which was tied up by the strike last Monday, is expected to be resumed by Thursday at the latest, it was said today by employers.

President's Appeal Heeded.

Gavin McNab, a San Francisco attorney, appointed Friday by President Wilson as a special representative of the Federal Shipping Board to the trouble here, said that a telegram received from the President appealing the strike had been heeded by the workers and their leaders.

President Wilson's telegram to Mr. McNab said that he had just been informed by Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Federal Shipping Board, that the strike had been heeded.

The telegram, after expressing hope that the strike would be ended, said that the men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

In a long gratifying, as it assures a prompt and satisfactory settlement, Mr. Hurley has also informed me that the men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

The men who agreed to return to work would be cleared up yesterday.

READS NOT GUILTY OF KING MURDER

Gaston B. Means Given Preliminary Hearing at Concord, N. C.

DEFICIENCY OF WOUND CHANGE IN PRINTING RULE

CONCORD, N. C., September 24.—Gaston B. Means, business agent and confidant of Mrs. Maude A. King, the wealthy widow whose death has resulted in a charge of murder being brought against him, pleaded not guilty at a preliminary hearing begun here today.

Means, backed by an array of counsel, exercised his legal privilege of declining to be examined before Magistrate Palmer, and the hearing was conducted by Magistrate Pitts. Attorneys representing the state of New York and Cook county, Ill., were present.

Means Has Eight Attorneys.

Means was represented by eight attorneys, headed by Frank L. Osborne, Charles E. Palmer, General Manning and with the prosecution, of which Solicitor Clement was the head. Assistant District Attorney Dooling, New York, completed the list of attorneys for the state. Both sides announced ready at 10:40 and Means entered a plea of not guilty.

L. A. Wellington, Concord undertaker, the first witness, told of removing the body of Mrs. King from Concord hospital to his undertaking establishment. After Means, he said, called him over the telephone to take charge of the body, he found it in a head behind left ear and fractured left ankle were only wounds on body, he said. He placed the body in a hermetically sealed casket and accompanied it to the undertaker's place at Asheville, August 24. There, he said, he placed the body in a receiving vault in Chicago. Gaston Means and Mrs. Maude A. King accompanied him to Chicago with the body.

They stopped over at Cincinnati, he said, where the body was placed in a vault. He said he thought Mrs. King wanted to order some flowers at Cincinnati.

Physician Describes Wound.

Dr. William H. Burmeister, chief of the medical staff of Cook county hospital, was the second witness. He told of performing an autopsy on the body of Mrs. King. He said that the wound was a bullet wound, apparently fired from a revolver, and that the bullet had entered the body at the left side of the chest, just above the left arm. There was no evidence of powder burns. Approximately about the left eyebrow was a small hemorrhage under the skin, but no abrasion on the outside.

He told of finding the leaden portion of the bullet on the right front side of the chest, having been deflected by the sternum. The bullet was found in the left side of the head near the channel of the ear. He said that the bullet had entered the head at the left side of the head, just above the left ear. There was no evidence of powder burns. Approximately about the left eyebrow was a small hemorrhage under the skin, but no abrasion on the outside.

Not Suicide, His Belief.

Solicitor Clement asked Burmeister if it would have been possible for Mrs. King to have inflicted upon herself the wound described.

The witness objected that this was not a question for an expert, but a matter of common knowledge, and also that he was not a physician, but an expert on pistols, even if it were granted that the question was an expert one.

He stated it was his opinion Mrs. King could not have inflicted the wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.

Dr. Burmeister was cross-examined on the powder burns and testified that a powder burn is a mark on the skin, but that it is not a wound. He said that he had examined the body and found no evidence of powder burns on the wound or skin around it.